

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY



PCT

To:
OKABE, Masao

**No.602, Fuji Bldg., 2-3,
Marunouchi 3-chome,
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
1000005
Japan**

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

17. 8. 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference
CFO18122WO

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/006610

International filing date (day/month/year)

11.05.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

12.05.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
Int.Cl' **G06F 1/32**

Applicant

CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later..

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Japan Patent Office

3-4-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8915, Japan

Authorized officer

TOMOYA AJIMA

Telephone No. +81-3-3581-1101 Ext. 3520

5E 9741

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/006610

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing

 - b. format of material
 - in written format
 - in computer readable form

 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - contained in the international application as filed.
 - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.	PCT/JP2004/ 006610
-------------------------------	--------------------

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
-----------	---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-21</u>	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	<u>1-21</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-21</u>	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

D1=[JP 2001-075687 A(FUJI XEROX Co., Ltd.)2001.03.23]

D2=[JP 2002-297465 A(CANON KK)2002.10.11]

D3=[JP 07-228026 A(CANON KK)1995.08.29]

The document 1 is considered to represent (regarded as being) the closest prior art for (to) the subject matter of claims 1-21. Document 1 discloses the network system that consists of printers, client devices, and a power-saving management device. A printer transmits a notice of power-saving shift to the power-saving management device, when shifting to a power-saving state. The power-saving management device has status of printers in its management table, and it watches demands of printing from client devices. When it receives a demand of printing from a client device, it transmits a demand of turning-on to a power-saving state printer, and the printer turns on.

The subject matter of claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the document 1 cited in the ISR and the document 2 cited in the same. The inventions disclosed in D1 and D2 share the problem in that a computer controls printers. The person skilled in the art would easily conceive the idea of applying the technical feature that a computer discovers printers by multicast address.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 21 are dependent on claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and so such also do not meet the requirements with respect to inventive step.

The subject matter of claims 3, 7, 11, 15 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the document 1 cited in the ISR and the document 2, 3 cited in the same. The inventions disclosed in D1, D2 and D3 share the problem in that a computer controls printers. The person skilled in the art would easily conceive the idea of applying the technical feature that a computer queries power-saving state printers by multicast address. It is necessary that different commands can set different addresses.